

REMARKS

In the May 9, 2008 Office Action, the claims 1, 7, 13, and 20 were objected to. Claims 1-20 were rejected as failing to comply with the written description requirement and claims 5 and 9 were rejected as being indefinite for failing particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Also, claims 1-20 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the May 9, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 13, and 20, and cancelled claims 5 and 9 as indicated above. Thus, claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-20 are pending, with claims 1, 7, and 13 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 13, and 20 are objected to because of the informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 as shown above. Specifically, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 to recite "a second portion that simultaneously shows at least [[an]] a detected abnormality for each of the corresponding paper supply unit and a notification not being an abnormality," as suggested. Also, Applicants have amended claim 20 to depend from claim 7, instead of claim 1, as suggested.

Applicants believe that the informalities for these claims are now corrected. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, and 13 as suggested as shown above to recite an operation unit or an operation function restricts operation of the paper supply unit selection when at least one abnormality has been detected. Applicants believe that the claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 9 were rejected 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. In response, Applicants have cancelled claims 5 and 9. Applicants believe that the cancellation of these claims renders these rejections moot.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 3-14 of the Office Action, claims 1-16 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants admitted prior art in view of Masuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,182,597, hereinafter "Masuda"). And in pages 14-16 of the Office Action, claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants admitted prior art in view of Masuda and Itagi (JP 11-184590), and further in view of Hosaka (JP 56154751). In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 7, and 13 as mentioned above.

In particular, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 now recite an abnormality management device that requires:

an abnormality display unit or function that displays with emphasis the location of the paper supply unit or paper discharge unit in which an abnormality was detected by the abnormality detection unit on the image of the image forming device, *the abnormality display unit or the abnormality display function displaying an abnormality by replacing characters representing a paper size to a symbol or an image in a paper remaining display location of a paper supply unit or paper discharge unit in which an abnormality has been detected by the abnormality detection unit, the abnormality display unit displaying the characters representing a paper size in which an abnormality is not being detected.*

Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Applicants admitted prior art, the Masuda patent, or any other prior art of record.

On page 5 of the Office Action, it is stated, and Applicants agree, that the Applicants admitted prior art does not teach an abnormality display unit that displays with emphasis the location of the paper supply unit or paper discharge unit in which an abnormality was detected by the abnormality detection unit on the image of the image forming device. Further, Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action cites Masuda to teach an abnormality

management device. Thus Applicants believe that the rejection relies on Itagi to show the abnormality display unit as stated on page 7 of the Office Action.

Specifically, the Office Action states on pages 7 and 8 that Itagi discloses an abnormality display unit and it shows a location of a paper jam, etc. generated on a particular paper supply unit at a glance, as shown in Figs. 13 and 14 of the Itagi publication. However, Itagi is completely silent about that the abnormality display unit or the abnormality display function displays an abnormality *by replacing characters representing a paper size to a symbol or an image* in a paper remaining display location of a paper supply unit or paper discharge unit in which an abnormality has been detected by the abnormality detection unit, and *the abnormality display unit displaying the characters representing a paper size in which an abnormality is not being detected*. In contrast to Itagi, the device of the present invention **does** displays the paper size when an abnormality is not being detected, in other words, the device of the present invention **does** displays the paper size under *normal* state. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an *apparent reason* for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of the independent claims 1, 7, and 13.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 2-4, 6, 8-12, and 14-20 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2-4, 6, 8-12, and 14-20 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claims 1, 7, and 13, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

Appl. No. 10/707,105
Reply to Office Action of May 9, 2008
Amendment dated August 5, 2008

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-4, 6-8, and 10-20 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Yoshiko Sugahara /
Yoshiko Sugahara
Limited Recognition No. L0395

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: August 5, 2008

S:\07-JUL08-YS\KM-US030558 Amendment.doc